

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed May 6, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the specification, the paragraph starting at page 13, line 8 has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. No new matter has been added.

**The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1, 25, 31, 37 (and presumably, 43) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Parnes (USP 6614801). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, the term "differential mode signal" as used and claimed in the present patent application is very well defined therein both in the text and in the drawings showing the signal.

The term "different mode signal" as used in Parnes in claims 2 and 10 (and nowhere else), as referred to in the Office Action, is not the same thing. Parnes' "different mode signal" refers to the operation of Parnes' method to process an incoming signal as a third type of signal if it cannot process it as a first type of signal (64K HDLC) or a second type of signal (56K HDLC).

Accordingly, claims 1, 25, 31, 37 and 43 have been amended to explicitly state that the steered signal is electric in nature as well as differential in nature (on the output). Parnes does not teach this, rather, he monitors the incoming signal and engages in computational processing in response to the received signal. He does not generate a differential mode output signal.

Accordingly, claims 1, 25, 31, 37 and 43, as presently amended, are allowable over the cited art.

Objected-To Claims

The remaining claims stand objected to as based upon a disallowed base claim but being otherwise allowable. These claims have all been amended to recite the subject matter of their base claims and, accordingly, are now all allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



David B. Ritchie  
Reg. No. 31,562

Dated: August 5, 2005

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040